

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-8 are currently pending.

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,961,212 to Marui et al. (“Marui”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,195,568 to Irvin (“Irvin”). The Office Action alleges that Marui discloses some of the features of independent claim 1. However, the Office Action acknowledges that Marui fails to disclose the feature of independent claim 1 of “wherein the stored voice signals are stored by at least one user of the device.” The Office Action alleges that column 4, lines 1-33 of Irvin teach “in an analogous art, that wherein the stored voice signals are stored by at least one user of the device.” The Office Action further alleges that “therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the stored voice signals are stored by at least one user of the device in order to provide automatically tailoring a communication device to suit the user’s preferences based on the user’s identity.” Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The cited portion of Irvin describes a telephone having a memory for storing a list of reference signatures in which each reference signature is associated with a pointer that identifies a memory location of an operational profile corresponding to the reference signature. Irvin describes that each reference signature is associated with an identity of a distinct and particular user, and an operational profile tailored to the preferences of that particular user. Irvin further describes that when a user supplies a proffered signature to the communication device, the proffered signature is compared to the stored reference signatures, and if a match is found, the communication device is configured according to the operational profile associated with the matched reference signature. Irvin further describes that if no match is found, normal operation of the telephone is inhibited. Thus, Irvin is directed to storing a list of reference signatures in a common memory area to allow a particular user to operate the telephone, and configure the telephone according to a user profile.

Applicant submits that there is no teaching or suggestion by Irvin that the reference signatures may function as voice signals stored by at least one user in a plurality of libraries in which each library is associated with an operational mode of an electronic device. Although,

Irvin describes that an operational profile may include speech recognition parameters, there is no teaching or suggestion that the speech recognition parameters are voice signals stored by at least one user in a library associated with an operational mode. Furthermore, Applicant submits that the voice recognition method described by Marui is used for an entirely different purpose than voice recognition in Irvin. Marui describes the use of voice recognition for voice-activated dialing, whereas voice recognition is described by Irvin as being used for identification of a particular user. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that it would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Marui and Irvin to arrive at the invention of independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 distinguishes over Marui in view of Irvin and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of independent claim 1 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 2 is directed to “an electronic device having a plurality of user selectable operating modes, each operating mode defining a set of operating parameters for the device, and having at least one voice activated function which is responsive to an input voice signal, wherein the reference voice signals are stored in the device by at least one user of the device and wherein the reference voice signals are stored in groups, each of which relates to a specific operating mode of the device.” For similar reasons as those discussed with respect to independent claim 2, Applicant respectfully submits that it would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Marui and Irvin to arrive at the invention of independent claim 2. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 2 distinguishes over Marui in view of Irvin and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of independent claim 2 be withdrawn.

Claims 3-5 are dependent upon and include the features of independent claims 1 and 2. Therefore, for at least the reasons as discussed with respect to independent claims 1 and 2, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3-5 also distinguish over Marui in view of Irvin and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of claims 3-5 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 6 is directed to “a method of operating an electronic device which has a plurality of operating modes for defining operating parameters of the device.” The method includes “storing reference voice signals in groups; associating the said groups with respective operating modes of the device; and using an associated group of reference signals for voice

signal matching in a chosen operating mode.” The Office Action alleges that Marui discloses some of the features of independent claim 6. The Office Action further alleges that column 5, lines 1-33 of Irvin teach “in an analogous art, that associating the said groups with respective operating modes of the device” and “therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the reference voice signals are stored by at least one user of the device in order to provide automatically tailoring a communication device to suit the user’s preferences based on the user’s identity.” Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As discussed with respect to independent claim 1, Irvin is directed to storing a list of reference signatures in a common memory to allow a particular user to operate the telephone, and configure the telephone according to a user profile. Applicant submits that there is no teaching or suggestion by Irvin of storing reference voice signals in groups in which the groups are associated with respective operating modes of a device. Furthermore, as also discussed with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant submits that the voice recognition method described by Marui is used for an entirely different purpose than that of Irvin. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that it would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Marui and Irvin to arrive at the invention of independent claim 6. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 6 distinguishes over Marui in view of Irvin and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of independent claim 6 be withdrawn.

Claims 7-8 are dependent upon and include the features of independent claim 6. Therefore, for at least the reasons as discussed with respect to independent claim 6, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 7-8 also distinguish over Marui in view of Irvin and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of claims 7-8 be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: September 21, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By Michael W. Maddox

Michael W. Maddox

Registration No.: 47,764

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL  
CORPORATION  
1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200  
Dallas, Texas 75202  
(214) 855-4500  
Attorneys For Applicant